



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

when it is memorized almost unconsciously. The teacher should go into every class with the idea, "What have I got that is nourishing or worth while?"—not merely with a list of facts to be gone over.

---

### **CONNECTING THE COLLEGE BIBLICAL WORK WITH THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.**

(Prof. George Dahl of Yale School of Religion.)

When asked for an opinion concerning the Biblical work done in colleges, one theological professor says: "The toy courses offered are of almost no value." A professor of Church History complains that he is unable to proceed with the teaching of his subject because the New Testament is an unknown book to his students, graduates of colleges; it is necessary for him to give first of all a course of readings in the Bible. My own experience with entering theological students has convinced me that even for the men who have taken Biblical courses in college the Old Testament is mysterious and unexplored ground. This ignorance of the Bible is astounding and tragic. No wonder, then, that the attitude of theological faculties toward college work in Bible is somewhat sceptical and tends even to become cynical.

To be sure, very few of the men in our theological schools come from the institutions represented here—the worse for our larger colleges and the ministry! The majority of our students come from smaller institutions, in some of which the Bible departments are most inadequately manned and equipped. And yet the few graduates of larger colleges who find their way into theological seminaries seem to know precious little about the Bible. May it not be that, from the standpoint of preparing men for the ministry at least, there are inherent defects and weaknesses in college courses as usually outlined?

In view of the tremendous tasks laid upon theological seminaries in preparing men for service in the present age, the unfortunate conditions I have indicated are of considerable importance. Theological education has increased vastly in variety and scope. Provision must be made not only for training men for the pastorate, but also for the allied fields

of missionary service, social service, religious education, and for Biblical and theological teaching in schools, colleges and universities. In addition, the large group of men who enter the home ministry cannot be considered equipped for their work unless they have, in addition to the old course of training, special work in the fields of Christian Sociology and Religious Education. This broadening of the field to be covered has resulted in crowding the curriculum, with the resulting danger of superficiality. In many quarters, therefore, the cry has been raised for a four year theological course. But it is a serious question whether we ought further to prolong the period of training. Men ought to be about their life work earlier than is now the custom in American professional life.

Would it not be better so to plan the work in college as to anticipate some of the preliminary work in theological education? We have a striking and successful analogy in the field of medical education. On the basis of elementary courses in Chemistry and other premedical subjects, the medical school goes ahead with advanced and strictly professional courses. There is no good reason why our colleges should not similarly lay foundations for theological education.

Now what are some of the things we may expect the college Biblical work to accomplish? One promising opportunity is in the field of the languages of the Bible. It is a crying shame that men should often enter our seminaries without even the most elementary knowledge of Greek. Almost the whole realm of New Testament exegesis must remain closed to these men unless they are offered a "hurry-up" course in the Greek language. Similarly, if a student is ever to gain first-hand mastery of the tremendous problems that center about the Old Testament he ought to take his elementary work in Hebrew while still in college. Thus the three precious years of seminary preparation could be devoted to more advanced study.

But a still more important task for the college department of Bible lies in giving the men a real mastery of the English Bible. By English Bible I mean either the authorized version or the American Revised version. All other arrangements of the bible text should be strictly subordinated to these standard versions and used simply as aids to their under-

standing and interpretation. Although we may entertain differing views of its inspiration, the Bible is still the principle text book for us all. All our students as they go out will handle the standard versions as generally used in our churches. With this particular source book they need to become thoroughly acquainted. More important than to know certain facts about the Bible is to know the Bible itself. It is often true that men entering our seminaries are unable to take up a Bible and turn to such perfectly familiar passages as the Ten Commandments and The Sermon on the Mount, or point to a single one of the great utterances of the prophets of Israel. Unless our students can tie up their knowledge about the Bible to the Bible itself, that knowledge will be of little use to them, nor will it long remain.

Again, I would urge that the students be thoroughly drilled on the broad outlines of Biblical history. A few days ago one of our most renowned professors at Yale dated the Exodus about 500 B. C. This represents about the amount of accurate knowledge possessed by many entering students. A framework of chronology and history is extremely important for all future study, and is often lost sight of in the confusion of too much material.

Another phase of Biblical study that may advantageously be emphasized in college is that which concerns itself with estimating relative values and interpretations of the material offered. The variant viewpoints of the priestly and the Jawhistic writers in the early books of the Old Testament, the theological prepossessions of the Chronicler, Paul's rabbinism and his allegorical methods of interpretation—all these can be made part of the preliminary training of our theological students. Of course the student must be made thoroughly familiar with the reasons underlying the modern interpretation of the Bible, in order that tedious hours of explanation may be avoided in theological classroom and that certain spiritual tragedies may be rendered unnecessary. And yet I would rather have a student hold to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch than fail to know the Pentateuch itself, its contents and spirit.

It is also extremely desirable that men should know at first hand standard authorities on the interpretation of the

text. The commentaries, Bible dictionaries and geographies, and some of the volumes on the history and literature of the Bible should be familiar. The ideal here is that students should be trained to do independent investigation in the Biblical libraries.

May I take the liberty of suggesting that certain courses must be modified if they are to meet the needs of those preparing to enter our theological schools. There are too many "birdseye view" courses in the average college Biblical curriculum. The process is something like this: First, the men are hurried through the vast mass of material contained in the Old and New Testaments in order to study Biblical History. Then again a hurried trip is made the next year to survey the Literature of the Bible. Similarly for Social Institutions and several other subjects. The result is that the class has at the end no clear grasp of any portion of the Bible, but rather a confused mass of misinformation and misconceptions about the whole Bible. My suggestion is that the divisions of the subject should again be made vertical instead of horizontal, that we study history and literature and whatever else seems advisable all at the same time for the various periods. This may mean a return to the division into Old Testament and New Testament courses. The point to be maintained is that something very definite and concrete be mastered. Perhaps it would be well that one course be confined to the Old Testament narratives, leaving the Prophets and the Poetry for other courses or for the theological school. Similarly in the New Testament the Gospels and the Epistles may be taken up in separate courses. My conviction is that our college courses in Bible by spreading over so much ground are in danger of becoming pretty thin.

Whether theological candidates should pursue during their college training, courses in Religious Education, Social Institutions of the Bible, etc., I greatly doubt. For students who do not intend to enter the ministry and whose training along this line ceases with the completion of the college course these subjects are admirable, provided the men have already laid the Biblical basis. But students who will later enter the seminary might better take general courses under experts in such subjects as Philosophy, Education and Sociology. The

choices would vary with the line of probable later emphasis. These courses will furnish the groundwork for their strictly theological courses. At this stage of training information is more important than interpretation or application. Several objections may be urged against the taking of work in Religious Education, etc., in college by prospective theological students. One consists in the danger that such courses will take off the edge and zest of more fundamental courses later on. Students will feel that they have already covered the ground. Again the college instructor is usually not an expert in the subject, inasmuch as it is only one of various subjects offered by him. Finally, by waiting until he is more mature the student will get much more out of this specialized part of his training.

Throughout my aim has been to plan for the needs of theological students alone. They belong just as certainly in a special class as do those who plan to enter law or medicine. The world needs real leadership along religious lines and it is our part as Bible teachers to see that the training of these prospective leaders is as nearly ideal as possible. We cannot toy with this work, for the King's business demands thoroughness even more than it demands haste. The supreme emphasis, I think all theological schools will agree, must be laid on an actual comprehension and grasp of the English Bible. Taking our college Biblical departments throughout the land, I think it is felt that this particular work must be done better or else better not be done at all. Nothing will so quickly gain standing and respect for college Bible teaching as the simple elementary feat of turning out men who actually know their Bibles. Our larger modern vision of Biblical truth must tie up in colleges with the Bible itself. Then the seminaries can carry on the good work and turn out men of God "complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

---

(Prof. W. H. Wood of Dartmouth College.)

The College Biblical work must be taken to include the personal work of the Professor as well as his catalogue courses. The Theological Seminary stands for a profession, the training place for the ministry; and also for the many

forms of modern religious work such as Religious Director, Missionary Leader, College Biblical Teacher and Community Leaders. Connecting the College Biblical Work with the Seminary will, therefore, suggest the discussion of the correlation of Biblical College courses with the work in the Seminary; the responsibility of the Professor in the College to direct men toward the Seminary and thus into some one of these various forms of religious work; and in a wider sense the responsibility of the colleges and particularly through the biblical department to supply the churches with educated leaders.

This paper will deal only with the first two of these problems. The third is an old one but of ever-recurring vitality. We would simply like to note in passing that there are indications today of a serious reconsideration of some apparently settled conclusions. That the colleges stand between the church and dissolution is a truth which thoughtful men dare not forget. There are some men among our college leaders who are thinking hard upon the old question of the relation of the Church to the State. They do not want a political State Church nor yet a theocratic Church State; but they see very clearly that religion and morality must function in state leadership and that we have perhaps leaned a little too far away from a working friendship between these two great institutions. If this thinking becomes contagious there will be a reflex influence upon the interpretation of the purpose of a college. There is noticeable also a swing of the pendulum towards the cultural ideal and away from the practical and commercial. This change will bring a new friendliness toward the biblical work in the college and thus increase the number of men looking toward the ministry. The words of President Hopkins in an address at the recent Sesqui-Centennial of Dartmouth seem bursting with hopeful prophecy. "It would be an affectation for us to define the purpose of Dartmouth College in the pious phrases of the eighteenth century, but it would be an unforgiveable omission to ignore the present-day equivalents of the motives which actuated Eleazor Wheelock in his unceasing efforts to establish this foundation. The founder's altruistic purpose of converting the heathen savage to the glory of God becomes in modern parlance a desire to convert society to the welfare of man. Either pur-

pose requires the highest idealism and the highest idealism is the purest religion the symbol of which is God and the manifestation of which is the spirit of Christ." If every college conceives of its purpose the converting of society then there exists fundamentally a relation to the ministry of the church.

Turning now to the questions of our courses and personal responsibility we note first that there are five outstanding conditions today which make these questions timely and which press for an answer. The first is the paucity of candidates for the ministry among the undergraduates in practically all of our colleges. The situation at Dartmouth can doubtless be duplicated in many places. Among the 1763 men registered this year there are but seven who declare it as their intention to enter the ministry. A few years ago there would have been as many as 10% of the whole student body. The professor in biblical work cannot ignore such a fact. The second is that the Seminaries are making definite requests of us to put on certain courses which will better fit the men who will enter them upon graduation from the College.

President Davis of Chicago Theological Seminary recently suggested a course in Modern Religious Thinking, one we are putting on next semester. Others are making other suggestions. The third is the bearing of the drives now being made by practically all the churches for recruits and candidates for the ministry. Such an educational campaign will inevitably increase the number of men in the colleges looking in this direction. What shall be our response and how can we express cooperation? The fourth is the fact that some colleges have already taken definite steps towards preparing men for community religious leadership. This indicates that the question has advanced for some at least from the discussion to the practical stage and demands consideration by all biblical teachers. The fifth is the presence in the consciousness of the undergraduate body of a new and insignificant moral and religious impulse. Our college men have recently faced reality looking into its stern visage with clear and open eye. The impress of this unfolding experience is still vividly present. Have we a new responsibility to try to conserve this epoch-making force and direct as many as possible toward definite religious work? These conditions with the questions



they raise seem to demand of us a clear answer and a practical program.

The answer we shall give will depend very naturally upon the type of college we find ourselves connected with. Roughly speaking there seem to be three differing types. The first is the out and out church college, the second and third the colleges where the academic ideal is defined as quite different from that of the church school and where biblical work is either required or elective.

In the first of these the answer will be comparatively easy to formulate. The church schools openly and avowedly declare it as their aim to supply the church with educated leaders. Religion and biblical studies are given a large place in the curriculum and there is no hesitation at teaching denominational dogmas and beliefs or in carrying on evangelistic or ecclesiastical propaganda to secure the desired end. Results are also obtained. One denomination reports that where 20% of the men in her church school enter the ministry but one per cent comes from among her students attending State Universities. In such colleges courses can be articulated with the Seminary work and the professor can work as he pleases in directing men to make the ministry the choice for their lifework. But as a professor he will nevertheless still have a serious task to perform. The academic ideal makes certain demands which he must see are fully met. Men must know and use the scientific method even in the study of the Bible, religion or beliefs. They must be trained in the power of discrimination and evaluation. They must feel the demand for evidence and be given the training in the collection and sifting of data. They should attain unto the true historical perspective distinguishing clearly between history and the philosophy of history. Religion must be rescued from any narrowing enfoldments or lonely isolation and be shown for what it really is, that is, not separate from life but as giving aim and quality to all of life. Such academic discipline backed up by the presence of the spirit of the Christ should send the Seminary both the number and quality of men they seek.

In the second and third of these types the answer is not so easy, because of the natural conditions. The so-called

ecclesiastical or evangelistic ideals are decidedly *persona non grata*. The aim of the college is not primarily to train men for the ministry, though it looks as if many now have no qualms in aiming directly at training school teachers, journalists and men for business pursuits. All biblical courses must pass censorship by a faculty committee before appearing in the catalogue, which means the right elimination of all denominational or doctrinal propaganda.

The academic ideal is not always shot through with moral and spiritual idealism though there seems to be a marked tendency today to emphasize this necessity. Because of the tendency to exalt the scientific ideal and the purely technical in education students have come to look upon biblical courses either as a means to pile up credits or as a side issue to be elected with varying motives. Some of the men who do intend to enter the ministry seem to think they ought to defer all biblical work until they reach the seminary. A few seem to be afraid to elect the courses thinking they will lose their religion or at least their accepted beliefs. That these courses do possess full academic value and are up to the standard of other college courses is often seriously doubted. Then as a matter of fact though without definite announcement other departments in the college deal quite extensively with religion, the bible and religious beliefs.

In the face of these conditions what practical suggestions can be made?

First as to our personal opportunity and responsibility. If there is in existence in the College a club such as the Wheelock Club at Dartmouth we should associate ourselves with it and be much with the men. This club is composed of all those men who are contemplating any sort of religious work as their lifework. If there is not such a club should we not consider trying to form one.

The professor can give one or two evenings a year at his home inviting all men looking toward definite religious work. The work of the ministry can be freely discussed, the men come to know each other better in the atmosphere of a common purpose and the call of unselfish lifework can be tactfully and yet seriously made prominent. Personally I look forward with great anticipation to these evenings.

In some colleges a significant opportunity is offered in connection with the Y. M. C. A. We are following the plan of asking the theological schools to send a representative to the college some time during the spring term to confer with all who are thinking along this line. The Y. M. C. A. gives the invitation, arranges for the meetings and seeks out the men. The men seem to appreciate this opportunity.

Some colleges are now naming one of the professors as Dean of lifework. This professor seeks to assist men in taking the step from graduation into their lifework. Here is an opportunity for cooperation and voluntary assistance.

The chapel exercises in some institutions offers an opportunity which is both direct and indirect. Many a student has testified that the words and spirit of the professor as chapel leader have not only strengthened slumbering convictions but also brought into their lives new resolves. Some of these resolves have been to dedicate themselves to the service of the church.

Then there is the question of evangelism. From many sources the advice and appeal reaches us to emphasize more strongly than we do the evangelistic note. Some would have us use our classroom exercises as evangelistic appeals while others would urge the teaching of the specific doctrines used in evangelistic preaching. The feeling that is back of this request is, that without this emphasis men will not be really reached by or instructed in the truth of the Bible and religion and therefore they will not hear the call to dedicate themselves to definite religious work.

To this conviction the reply must be made that the College is not a church nor is a professor an evangelist. There are different gifts of the same spirit and different times and places for the expression of the different gifts. All men in college chairs are not fitted for this work at any time or place. Evangelism as too often illustrated would be sadly out of place in an up-to-date college. The misuse of the Bible and the type of religious experience often revealed would repulse rather than attract the college man. But after this has been said the case is not closed. The end sought and not the means is the essential thing. When a man stands out as a teacher of the Bible—a religious educator—he necessarily represents

those teachings and is supposed to be supremely interested in having men value them as he does. Is it not true that it is the man in any profession or calling who attracts others to choose that profession? In our work there is surely a winning force in the work and spirit of the professor who can be at once scientific and enthusiastic, who can loose unworthy bonds and at the same time suggest worthy ones and who daily, patiently and consistently constructs a larger and more winsome idealism.

The personal influence of the professor consciously and unconsciously is daily drawing or repelling men to or from the work he does and represents. While this is true of all teachers it is especially true of the men in our profession. We place the Bible and religion in our college classes upon the same plane as the literature and knowledge of the other courses. If then, as is generally conceded our Bible and the truths of religion possess peculiar value this conviction and knowledge will become a conscious fact only by reason of the scholarly habits, the open-mindedness and the manifest religious spirit of the teacher. Stress should therefore be placed upon the expression of strong clear assertion of honest, positive and self-satisfying faith and hope.

As to our courses the first question relates to Greek and Hebrew. We do not need to consider Greek because a student can always elect academic Greek and in most instances he can read the biblical text in place of the classical. Hebrew, however, is rarely offered in the academic courses, though as far as we know there would be no objections offered by the college authorities were a sufficient number of men to elect this study. It would seem as if we could do the seminary and the cause of religious education a great favor by offering at least one course a year in a study the knowledge of which should be considered a necessity for the well-trained teacher or preacher.

Then in addition to our regular courses in biblical history and literature we could now add one in Modern Religious Thinking. This course would trace the development of religious thinking from Kant to the present time with special emphasis upon evolutionism, socialism, spiritualism, Christian Science and other modern isms. The value to the seminary of

such a historical study is apparent. The way will have been prepared for the intensive study and research which it is the peculiar duty of the Seminary to undertake.

In conclusion one general word. In our teaching we seek to find and display not only approved truth but beyond this the values which flow significantly from the bare truth. Three such VALUES may be discovered as characteristic of the ideal we have ever before us in our work. These are to place personalism obtrusively over against the impersonalism which flourishes in much of the teaching of the hour; to develop the sense of spiritual evaluation over against the materialism everywhere rampant even in modern spiritualistic dress; and to clarify the knowledge that religion is a fundamental and not a derived product of any sort. Religion is not a mere field for the application of any and every theory that may be proposed but greater than these is the judge and test of all.

---

### **ONE WAY TO STUDY THE PENTATEUCH**

(Prof. Irving F. Wood, of Smith College.)

I have said "One way," for there are many ways to study the Pentateuch, and several of them are appropriate for College use. The way I have in mind is, primarily, for the understanding of the literature.

In order to understand any literature I conceive that the following are necessary:

1. An understanding of the special purpose of the writer in this particular piece of literature.
2. Some knowledge of his general habit of thought, his mental atmosphere. If we know nothing about him personally we must rely on a knowledge of the civilization from which he writes, his religious, political or artistic school, or whatever may be the field in which the main interest of his work lies.
3. The recognition of the type of literature which he chooses as the medium of his expression; whether prose or verse, oratory, history, or fiction.

We make these presuppositions of all literature; unconsciously of familiar literature, consciously of literature which